

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/783,711

Applicant(s)

STUTTARD, DAVID
MICHAEL

Examiner

Jared J. Furman

Art Unit

2876

All Participants:

(1) Mr. Jared J. Furman (PTO).

(2) Ms. Patricia A. Limbach (50,295).

Status of Application: allowed

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 July 2003

Time: 2:30 PM

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

1, 5, 9, 18 and 26.

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Jared J. Furman
Jared J. Furman
Art Unit 2876

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: During the telephone interview, Ms. Limbach authorized an examiner's amendment to claims 1, 5, 9, 18, and 26, in order to place the application into condition for allowance. The examiner's amendment to claims 1, 5, 9, and 26 was required in order to remove any claim objections and/or rejections under 35 USC 112 2nd paragraph. The examiner's amendment to claim 18 was required in order to remove any claim objections and to make claim 18 correspond to the marked up version of claim 18 provided in the amendment filed on 11/21/2002 (amendment A, paper number 9), since the clean version of claim 18 did not correspond to the marked-up version of claim 18 (the marked up version of claim 18 is what the examiner indicated was allowable, see the statement of reasons for allowance in the office action mailed 4/3/2003, paper number 13).

C